CITED ART FAILS TO ANTICIPATE CLAIMS 1, 13

Claims 1 and 13 recite:

a first database system directly storing first database records in first data blocks having a first data block size;
concurrently with said first database system storing first database records in first data blocks having a first data block size, said first database system directly accessing a copy of second data blocks in which a second database system directly stored second database records;
said second data blocks having at least one data block with a second data block size different than said first data block size;
wherein said first data blocks are first atomic units of storage allocated to store said first database records; and
wherein said second data blocks are second atomic units of storage allocated to store said second database records.

Claims 1 and 13 teach that the first database system is concurrently storing and handling data blocks of different sizes and that data blocks are "atomic units of storage allocated to store...database records." Such features are not suggested much less disclosed by Salkewicz. Salkewicz mentions absolutely nothing about data blocks, much less data block sizes. Claims 1 and 13 illustrate that even though data block sizes may be different between two databases, data may still be accessed from a second database by the first database system and integrated into the first database.

Salkewicz teaches how synchronization can be performed for a distributed database system when a new server is added to a network, or when a server is initialized after a server failure or loss of connection with the network. Specifically, Salkewicz teaches how data from a source database is copied and transferred to a destination database. A feature of Salkewicz is that the source database system can still make modifications while the transferring takes place (col. 1 lines 53-65). Another feature of Salkewicz is that a copy of the source database need not be kept to transfer data to the destination database (col. 1 line 66 to col. 2 line 25). Salkewicz teaches that the source database is divided into segments where each segment contains at least one database

record, and that the source database system continually monitors whether modifications have been made to segments that have already been transferred. The segments are transmitted sequentially from the first database to the new or initialized second database until all the segments have been transmitted to the second database (col. 2 lines 39-50).

Salkewicz makes no mention of database data blocks or data block sizes as issues anywhere. Salkewicz thus could not disclose, much less suggest, that a database system is *concurrently storing* data in data blocks of a certain size *and accessing* data blocks of a different size, as taught by claims 1 and 13. Salkewicz thus does not teach how a given database system can access data blocks from another database system where the data blocks from the given database and data blocks from the other database have different sizes.

Response to Rejection

Apparently, the Final Office Action rejection is based on a correlation drawn between "data blocks" and "data block size" of claims 1 and 13 and "segment" and "segment length" described in Salkewicz. The rejection asserted that "first data block size" of claims 1 and 13 refers to "the segment length of the source database." The rejection also asserted that "a second data block size" of claims 1 and 13 refers to "the segment length of the destination database." However, there is no difference between the segment length of the source database and the segment length of the destination database. When a segment is generated, it is the *same size* for both the source and destination databases throughout the transferring process (col. 6 lines 33-65, fig. 6). Furthermore, "segments are generated as a *temporary* mechanism for synchronizing the databases" (lines 54-55 of column 5).

The Final Office Action incorrectly suggests that Salkewicz teaches a first database system *concurrently storing* data blocks having a first data block size *and accessing* a copy of data blocks of a different data block size. Presumably the "first database" has been correlated to the "destination database" described in Salkewicz because data transferred in segments is destined for the first database. Salkewicz teaches that, during a given synchronization, the destination database only receives and stores data of the same segment length (col. 6, lines 33-49, fig. 6; col. 10, lines 55-65, fig. 10). Assuming that between separate synchronizations, the segment length may be different, then at best Salkewicz discloses that segments of different size are accessed at different times, that is, at separate synchronizations. However, Salkewicz does not disclose that different sized segments are accessed concurrently during the same synchronization, much less that a database system concurrently accesses and stores data in different sized data blocks, as claimed.

Based on the foregoing, claims 1 and 13 are patentable. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1 and 13 is respectfully requested.

Pending Claims

The pending claims not discussed so far are dependant claims that depend on an independent claim that is discussed above. Because each of the dependant claims include the limitations of claims upon which they depend, the dependant claims are patentable for at least those reasons the claims upon which the dependant claims depend are patentable. Removal of the rejections with respect to the dependant claims and allowance of the dependant claims is respectfully requested. In addition, the dependent claims introduce additional limitations that independently render them patentable. Due to the fundamental

difference already identified, a separate discussion of those limitations is not included at this time.

Conclusion

For the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are patentable over the art of record, including the art cited but not applied. Accordingly, allowance of all claims is hereby respectfully solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Dated: June 14, 2004

Marcel K. Bingham
Reg. No. 42,327

1600 Willow Street
San Jose, CA 95125
Telephone No.: (408) 414-1080 ext.206
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

on June 14, 2004 by Trudy Bagdon
TRUDY BAGDON